

# **PCAST Report Workgroup Draft Transcript January 7, 2011**

## **Presentation**

### **Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Good afternoon, everybody and welcome to the first meeting of the PCAST Report Workgroup. This is a Federal Advisory Committee, which means the public are listening in and there will be opportunity at the end of the call for the public to make comments. We're also transcribing the meeting and because it is being audio-transcribed, if you could please remember to identify yourselves when speaking for attribution.

I'll just do a roll call, say your name and then just say a sentence or two about yourself, where you are.  
Paul Eggerman?

### **Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Here. I'm an Entrepreneur and I'm calling from Weston, Massachusetts.

### **Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Okay. Bill Stead?

### **William Stead – Vanderbilt – Chief Strategy and Information Officer**

Here. I'm Bill Stead. I'm the Chief Strategy and Information Officer at Vanderbilt.

### **Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Dixie Baker?

### **Dixie Baker – Science Applications Intl. Corp. – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yes, I'm here. I am the Chief Technology Officer for the Healthcare Practices, Science Applications International and a member of the HITSP Standards Committee.

### **Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Hunt Blair?

### **Hunt Blair – OVHA – Deputy Director**

Yes, I'm here. I'm the Director of the Division of Healthcare Reform in the State of Vermont. I'm also the State Health IT Coordinator.

### **Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Tim Elwell?

### **Tim Elwell – Misys Open Source Solutions – Vice President**

Yes, I'm the Vice President from Misys Open Source Solutions.

### **Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Carl Gunter?

**Carl Gunter – University of Illinois – Professor**

Hi, I'm a Professor at the University of Illinois, specializing in security topics.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

John Halamka?

**John Halamka – Harvard Medical School – Chief Information Officer**

John Halamka, I'm the CIO at Beth Israel Deaconess and Harvard Medical School and Co-Chair of the HIT Standards Committee.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Leslie Harris?

**Leslie Harris – Center for Democracy & Technology – President & CEO**

Hi, I'm Leslie Harris. I'm the President of the Center for Democracy and Technology. We're an Internet policy organization. We have a big health privacy project.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Stan Huff? He might not be on. I think he's in Australia at the HL7. Robert Kahn?

**Robert Kahn – Corporation for National Research Initiatives – President & CEO**

Yes, I'm President & CEO of Corporation for National Research Initiatives. It's a non-profit in the Washington area focusing on research and development for national infrastructure with a focus on IT.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Gary Marchionini?

**Gary Marchionini – University of North Carolina – Dean & Professor**

Hi, I'm Professor at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina. I'm also recently the Dean here and my research sits at the intersection of information retrieval and human computer interaction.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Thank you. Steve Ondra?

**Stephen Ondra – NeHC – Senior Policy Advisor**

Yes, I work at the Office of Science and Technology Policy at the White House.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

John Perlin? Richard Platt?

**Richard Platt – Harvard Medical School – Professor & Chair**

Yes, I'm Professor and Chair of the Harvard Medical School Department of Population Medicine at the Harvard Pilgrim Healthcare Institute. I'm the Principal Investigator of the FDA's Mini-Sentinel Program.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Okay. Wes Rishel?

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Inc. – Vice President & Distinguished Analyst**

I work for Gartner, Incorporated. I'm a member of the HIT Standards Committee.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Mark Rothstein? He was on. Steve Stack?

**Steven Stack – St. Joseph Hospital East – Chair, ER Dept.**

I'm Steve Stack. I'm an emergency physician in Lexington, Kentucky and I'm also the Secretary of the American Medical Association.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Eileen Twiggs?

**Eileen Twiggs – Planned Parenthood Federation of America – Director**

Hi, Eileen Twiggs. I'm the National Director of Information Systems and Strategy for Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Okay, thank you all and I'll turn it over to Paul Eggerman and Bill Stead.

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Thank you very much, Judy. I want to start by saying Happy New Year. It's a great way to start the first week of the new year is to start with a new workgroup, so I want to thank everybody for participating in this call. I know we put it together with very short notice. What we're trying to do in this call is really just introductory. We want to make sure people understand what we're going to be doing with our work and what the overall plan is.

As Judy Sparrow said, to make sure everybody understands, we are a Federal Advisory Committee, which means that what we do is we give advice. The people we give advice to is the Office of the National Coordinator (ONC). We do that by producing comments or suggestions or, in this case, we're going to be producing options and we provide that to the HIT Standards Committee and to the HIT Policy Committee and it will be eventually the HIT Policy Committee that will, hopefully, approve, but possibly amend or change whatever it is that we produce.

When we went around and people introduced themselves, I have to say I was somewhat in awe. This is an extraordinary group of people that we have on this workgroup and so I want to thank you for participating. If there are any members of the public who are listening to this call, I also want to thank you for participating in our effort.

We will have a time at the end of each call for public comment and, as you will see in our discussions, we take the public comment extremely seriously and that will be a major part of our effort will be to consider the public reaction to this report called the PCAST Report. I mentioned this is a new year; PCAST Report came out at the end of 2010. We're starting this year, 2011, this is the first week when institutions have a chance to register for stage one of meaningful use and we are also assembled as a workgroup for the purpose of really giving guidance and advice to ONC relative to what are the options to implement the PCAST Report.

I'm your Chairperson. My job will be simply to make sure that we stay on topic or in the vicinity of the topic and that we produce a document that everyone feels comfortable with, that they have the opportunity to participate in the production of that document.

Let me pause a minute and see if my colleague and Co-Chair, Bill Stead, would like to say anything.

**William Stead – Vanderbilt – Chief Strategy and Information Officer**

Thank you, Paul. I am excited by the chance to work with this group. I think we need to be very careful to make sure that we begin by actually understanding what the report says. It's written by a number of people that come from other industries and disciplinary backgrounds and although we use many of those same words, they may mean different things to us and so I think that it's going to be important and exciting to really come to grips with what this new view actually looks like. So, I appreciate the opportunity to serve with the group.

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Great. Thank you very much, Bill, and I appreciate having a chance to work with you. I appreciate having a chance to work with you and to work with everybody. Judy Sparrow said that this group is being led by an entrepreneur and a professor. Bill Stead and I have very different backgrounds, just as everybody on the workgroup has different backgrounds and so, hopefully, those differences will help us come to some interesting discussions and interesting conclusions.

Has Farzad been able to join the call yet?

**Farzad Mostashari – ONC – Deputy National Coordinator for Programs & Policy**

Yes, I'm here.

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Terrific. So, what I think what we would like to do then is ask you, Farzad—it's very fortunate that you are on the call. It shows the importance of this work to have the Deputy National Coordinator on the call and I'm wondering if you would take us through a discussion of what you would like to see us produce for you?

**Farzad Mostashari – ONC – Deputy National Coordinator for Programs & Policy**

Thank you. It is truly impressive, listening to the roster and what people's backgrounds and levels of achievement are and it is humbling. We continue to be so grateful to you all for contributing to the president's health IT agenda, giving us advice, helping us understand the landscape—the scientific landscape, the policy landscape. We really could not have made the progress we have made in the past year and a half without the Health IT Policy Committee, the Health IT Standards Committee and all the many workgroups that have worked for no personal gain, for the public good. We are immensely grateful.

On December the 8<sup>th</sup> the President's Council of Advisors on Science & Technology (PCAST), yet another Federal Advisory Committee that is comprised of the nation's leading scientists and engineers, made some policy recommendations and issued a report entitled, "Realizing The Full Potential of Health Information Technology To Improve Healthcare for Americans: The Path Forward." It is an indication of how seriously the president takes science and how important he feels science is to the nation's agenda, as well as his scientific advisors in terms of how seriously we are taking these recommendations in this report. We want it really considered by the best minds in the country to help, first of all, as Bill said, to help us explain and understand what the full implications of the report are when it comes to interoperability and Health Information Exchange, in particular.

It is a rule of explaining, of translating exegesis of docking, in a sense, some of the concepts and languages and the vocabulary that is used here to the health IT word, as we know it. To understand what the implications are of things like the universal exchange language for what has already happened in health IT standards and interoperability to relate those to each other and help us understand the implications of the report for the health IT strategy that ONC is pursuing and has been pursuing.

We are not asking for recommendations from you per se, and we're certainly not asking one FACA committee to pass judgment on another FACA committee's recommendations or conclusions. We really want to understand better from you what the implications are in terms of our strategy and what would be some of the options for improving what we're doing. We're always looking for insights, new insights and new approaches for improving the health IT strategy and getting to the goals as the title itself says, realizing the full potential of health information technology to improve health and healthcare for all Americans.

I'm really going to leave it there and thank you, again, for your service and turn it back to Paul and Bill.

**Robert Kahn – Corporation for National Research Initiatives – President & CEO**

Paul and Bill, before you pick up, I'm going to have to drop off now because of this other commitment I have, but I spent quite a bit of time when I was in government and shortly thereafter helping to draft changes to the FAR to deal with advisory committees and special government employees. So I just want to ask a generic question on behalf of everyone on the call.

If this is, in particular, a Federal Advisory Committee could somebody give us a read on whether we are considered special government employees within the—I happened on the section of the code, it's 18USC code 202, and what the implications are for us? What must we recuse ourselves from if we have personal interests in it? What are the effects of bringing up topics that reflect that and so forth?

We don't have to do it right now, but in one of the next meetings could somebody clarify that for the folks who are on the committee so we all know?

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Yes, Dr. Kahn, I can certainly send an e-mail around, but basically you are not a special government employee, you're representational. So, in that sense you're not acting for yourself. You're acting as the representation of a group. I will clarify all that by e-mail.

**Robert Kahn – Corporation for National Research Initiatives – President & CEO**

Okay, I appreciate it. I'm sorry, guys, I can't stay on longer, but I'll join in subsequent meetings. Take care.

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Thanks. Also with respect to the last question and answer I'd just say it's a great position to be in, to be able to say and do whatever you would like, is basically what we're able to do, but thank you very much, Farzad, for that discussion. I also just want to say thank you, Farzad, and through you to all of ONC for your leadership in this area and in so many other areas. The charge that you have given us is just somehow typical of the way you have been leading us to go about things, which is simply to look at things very directly, not make any judgments and provide you with options. So, this is a great opportunity.

If you received a slide deck in the e-mail, you have a slide that says, Workgroup Charge. Normally, we would put this up on sort of an Internet Web broadcast, but we put this meeting together so fast that we did not have time to do that, so I would encourage you to open that, if you don't have it already opened, that e-mail. If anybody needs it sent again from Judy— Does anybody need it sent again? If so, just say so.

But the Workgroup Charge, what it says on that slide is there are really four bullets. The first is that we are to assist ONC in synthesizing and analyzing the public comments and input to the PCAST Report. The public comments are, there was an item in the Federal Register and there is a formal process right

now ongoing for people to comment so we're first to help ONC understand those public comments. Second, we are to discuss the implications of the report on current ONC strategies. Third, we are to assess the feasibility and impact of the PCAST Report on ONC programs. Fourth, we are to elaborate on how those recommendations could be integrated into the ONC strategic framework.

So, we are to do all of those things. We have a deadline, which is we would like to complete all of those activities by the time of the April HIT Policy Committee Meeting, so we have about three months to complete those activities.

Let me pause and see if any of that makes sense and what questions people might have about the charge and if Farzad is still on the call, any questions they might have for Farzad.

**Steven Stack – St. Joseph Hospital East – Chair, ER Dept.**

Thank you for the clarification and the charge and so far as that, for the intro. The group we have here is fantastic, as is usual, so I continue to be impressed with the effort that people volunteer to these causes. One thing that I noticed, though, in the PCAST Report there is a lot of discussion about the need for CMS to really essentially revolutionize its IT infrastructure in order to be part of this new interoperable world. I wonder if we would be well served by trying to get a person or two from CMS as part of this workgroup, just because that looks so integral to that administration's ability to interface with this, regardless of the means by which we do it.

**Farzad Mostashari – ONC – Deputy National Coordinator for Programs & Policy**

I'm glad you brought that up, Steve. I should clarify and I probably should have clarified, there are a number of recommendations in the PCAST Report that deal with a number of different issues. The work of this committee is really to think about the implications of it for interoperability. There are some very, very substantive, substantial ideas here in terms of the different approach to Information Exchange and interoperability that is going to be the focus of the workgroup.

There are other committees; there is actually an IOM Committee and others who are taking a close look at the CMS infrastructure issue and I think we would be well served by focusing on the interoperability section of the recommendations for our tasks.

It's a big enough chunk to bite off, but thank you so much for bringing up that clarification.

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

That was a great question, Steve. When you read the report, at the end of the report, I think it's pages 77 and 78, there is a summary of recommendations and there is a section that says, "The Office of the National Coordinator should," and lists like six or seven recommendations of the report. Then there is a section on what CMS is supposed to be doing and then there is a recommendation for what HHS needs to do. Then it goes on to other agencies even. So, I interpreted that what we are focused in on is the section for what ONC should be doing, which really relates almost entirely to interoperability.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications Intl. Corp. – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

With respect to the first bullet, in what form will we get these public comments and inputs?

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

I'm not exactly sure of the actual form or format. When we talk about next steps, the meeting after next, we will get a summary from ONC of the public comments, but I believe they're all entered into regulation.gov and so there probably will be some vehicle for us to read them all ourselves, although I think ONC staff people are going to help us by summarizing in some format.

**Dixie Baker – Science Applications Intl. Corp. – CTO, Health & Life Sciences**

Yes, that's what I was asking, so there will be written comments that the public has provided versus public hearings.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Well, we will be doing a hearing also, although this bullet I think really relates to the formal process; I don't know whether I'm saying that, regulation.gov, is that the right place where the comments are put in?

**Jenny Daniel**

This is Jenny Daniel. Right now we have a request for comment that was put in the Federal Register with comments due on I believe it's the 17<sup>th</sup>, so what we plan to do is have folks review those comments and try to summarize them for presentation to this workgroup. We also can make those comments available to folks who are interested in reading either specific comments or all of the comments we get. So, we will definitely provide a summary of those comments we get through that process and we'll also make them available to anybody who is interested in looking at the comments themselves.

**Farzad Mostashari – ONC – Deputy National Coordinator for Programs & Policy**

Similar to what we've done in the past with meaningful use, there will be significant staff support for the workgroup. We do not expect you to be reading through and doing the mass work, mass action work of synthesizing. It's really synthesizing the concept behind the comments that have been submitted and highlighting those that you find particularly relevant to the nation's health IT strategy.

**William Stead – Vanderbilt – Chief Strategy and Information Officer**

The other input that we will be getting is the report from the January 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Interoperability Meeting that ONC is holding, which will get us a variety of computer science input, for example, about the report.

**Farzad Mostashari – ONC – Deputy National Coordinator for Programs & Policy**

Yes, as Bill alluded to, there is a relatively small meeting that had been planned actually for some time on January 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> on the Next Generation of Interoperability. The PCAST will be certainly one of the issues that are discussed there with some of the real computer science luminaries, Bill and others who serve on both committees I think as well as the written report and findings from that workshop should prove useful to the committee for their considerations.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Other questions for Farzad or other questions about the workgroup charge?

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Inc. – Vice President & Distinguished Analyst**

Just a small point; the charge includes references to specific ONC initiatives and strategies. We should all be working from the same page in terms of where those are elaborated, so URLs or something like that would be helpful.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

That's an excellent point, Wes. We basically have two things we've got to do. One is to just make sure that we all understand the PCAST Report and we have a common understanding of the report, but also we need to have a common picture of what the various ONC strategies and programs are because depending on; they is sort of uneven involvement in ONC in the members of this workgroup. In other words, some people have been deeply involved, other people this is all somewhat new to them. So, we need to come up with some vehicle to educate people. That's an excellent point.

Other questions about the workgroup charge? So, the absence of questions suggests to me either this is all crystal clear or it's Friday afternoon and it's been a very busy first week of the year, which is, I suspect a little bit of both. But to emphasize what this is all about, this is all about assisting ONC in understanding, in effect, what are the options, what are the alternatives for implementing the PCAST Report, what we can list in terms of how ONC can go about doing that.

If we look at the next slide in the deck, which shows the meeting dates, what I wanted to do was to sort of very briefly walk you through the next series of steps that we are intending to do. So, we have a meeting scheduled in another week, on January 14<sup>th</sup>, from 2:00 to 4:00. What our plan is for that meeting and what our goal is for that meeting is to work on making sure that everybody is on the same page on the PCAST Report, that we have a common understanding of that report.

So we are going to have, I think it's Bill Press, somebody from PCAST come in and give a bit of a presentation on the report. We will have an opportunity to ask him questions. One of our workgroup members, John Halamka, was also on the PCAST Workgroup, so he can also provide some continuity. Then the other thing that Bill Stead and I were thinking of doing on the 14<sup>th</sup> was to try to see if we can get prepared at least one or two interoperability examples that would sort of show in effect this is how things work now or at least now in terms of stage one of meaningful use. This is an example of what it would look like with what is being suggested in PCAST.

The purpose of doing examples is really to be just very concrete, at least to illustrate what's being talked about with this interoperability approach. So, the first step is really very simple. It is to get all on the same page as to what this report means. The homework I'm going to suggest, if you haven't already done so, is to read the report very carefully between now and the 14<sup>th</sup>.

I want to talk about what we're going to do after that, but let me pause and see if people have any other ideas as to what we need to do to make sure that we're all on the same page on the report or any other information people would like about PCAST to provide like a foundation for our discussions.

#### **John Halamka – Harvard Medical School – Chief Information Officer**

Paul, I have written a couple of Cliff Notes versions of the report summarizing its major themes and I will send you those because they're on my blog. I've also done some samples showing what are the current state of standards and how does a CCD or a CCR or some of these other existing standards actually appear today for representing something like a medication list. So, I'll send those all off to you.

#### **Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

That's great, John. I'm smiling as you said that because when I said there were examples we were going to prepare, I just took a guess that you'd be the one who did it. So I'm not at all surprised that you've got that and that is the intention, is to try to help people understand this issue, what the issues are, so that forms like a foundation for our work. Is there anything else that people would like on the January 14<sup>th</sup> meeting in terms of understanding PCAST, is there something else we should be doing?

#### **William Stead – Vanderbilt – Chief Strategy and Information Officer**

Let me just follow up on that last point a second. John, would it be possible to take a specific example of, say, a summary as marked up in one of the existing standards and then set beside that what it would look like if it were disaggregated in some way, as suggested by the report and marked up with the contextual metadata the report is suggesting? So people could actually see the difference that is described in words, in particular, say, pages 69, 70, 71 or so of the report, that early part of the roadmap. Is there a way to come up with a picture of that? I think that might help people understand it, if that's possible?



**John Halamka – Harvard Medical School – Chief Information Officer**

Well, the fascinating question, of course, that will be debated by many of the great minds on this group, given that there are existent XML standards that are part of meaningful use stage one that already are disaggregated and already have metadata, is there truly a gap? So, part of what I will send is actually showing what it is that is the meaningful use standards already suggested because they actually may meet many of the requirements that PCAST has outlined.

**William Stead – Vanderbilt – Chief Strategy and Information Officer**

Understood, but it would seem to me the way that we could wrestle that to the ground was if you or if not you one of the other people that actually wrote the report could actually show what it might look like so we could actually see what the gap was or was not.

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Inc. – Vice President & Distinguished Analyst**

I hesitate to speak up for fear of being confused with a volunteer, but I think part of the issue here is that we're comparing a standard to an idea and the idea is, "There's a simpler way to do it." Now, if there is an experiential base for the idea then it would be great to have someone not—it would be too much to ask for them to give a totally polished counter-example because, as we all know, things are complex. There are ways that you don't know they're complex and so you try to make them simple, but if we had someone who could sort of just say, well, here's how it might look in the simplified view, speaking from an experiential base somehow that would be extremely helpful I think.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Wes has just made a very important point is we're comparing exactly as you say, standards to an idea. So, one of the challenges, Wes, I'm not quite sure the folks who actually wrote to the PCAST Report what the XML would look like they envision.

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Inc. – Vice President & Distinguished Analyst**

I'm not sure that they're sure. All I know for sure is that they believe that there is a process to arrive at that, but I also believe that there are systems out there. I'm not going to name the vendor here, but there are vendor systems out there that use approaches that may or may not be XML-based, but have this kind of disaggregated characteristic that Bill described and I'm wondering; I'd like to get something other than speculation on the general trend of innovation. I think there are two things we know about innovation: one is that we can count on it to totally amaze us; and two, we cannot count on it to solve any specific problem we have in mind on a given day.

**Leslie Harris – Center for Democracy & Technology – President & CEO**

I really agree with that. The report is highest level and we have nothing in the real world to map it up against what we're doing now and so I would love to see, even in the roughest form what would it look like if you were not looking at a single report.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Again, the purpose of this approach is to make sure we're all on the same page and it's just to get us on the same page, to have a sense of what we're talking about in PCAST to try to do this as best as we can to clearly understand it. So, if I hear you right, Leslie, you think this is a good idea.

**Leslie Harris – Center for Democracy & Technology – President & CEO**

Yes, I think it's work for somebody, so I'm a little hesitant. Plus, whoever is doing it is still going to be making it up, right?

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

So, I'm a little unclear what should happen next, Wes?

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Inc. – Vice President & Distinguished Analyst**

Well, I'm suggesting they might be able to find a volunteer to serve as an advocate. I don't feel prepared to do that myself in terms of the knowledge or the approach, but I think some of us on the committee have talked to some people out there who might. I don't want this to turn into an adversarial thing as much as someone willing to explore that simple idea to a level where we can at least talk about it. I have an unrelated comment I'd like to make at the right point in the agenda.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Okay, let's see if we can resolve this issue. John?

**John Halamka – Harvard Medical School – Chief Information Officer**

Well, what I can tell you is that Wes has a very good idea, which is I could actually document some examples of the current state of meaningful use standards. Wes and I both know that there are going to be some people out there in the vendor space who would probably be willing to volunteer what this vision of a data atomic metadata rich XML might look like. That would be a very good thing for them to provide.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Okay, so maybe if I could ask the two of you to perhaps through e-mails see if we could pursue that in the next couple of days? That would be terrific. Wes, you said you had unrelated issue or a different topic?

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Inc. – Vice President & Distinguished Analyst**

Yes, and I didn't want this to distract from this current idea, which I think is excellent, but my current interpretation of the report on a single reading is that it is also a bit about a less constrained approach to interoperability than the specific use cases essentially prescribed by law and regulation for meaningful use. Therefore I think it would be worth envisioning what are important use cases not in the meaningful use strategies, where this may be application. For example, generally in research it seems to be, the availability of the data for research seems to be a focus and that's really not something that has been clearly called out in the meaningful use criteria.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Excellent observation. So, you're suggesting that there might be some use cases that we present.

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Inc. – Vice President & Distinguished Analyst**

Yes, in terms of the agenda for understanding the PCAST Report, I think that it may be work not necessarily the same level of detail that we just described, but envisioning some use cases. How they might happen around research or other areas that we all know are critical to achieving the value of health IT, but aren't necessarily called out explicitly in the very structured approach that has been necessary in order to create a body of regulations around meaningful use that would let us pay incentive money.

**Carl Gunter – University of Illinois – Professor**

The report does contain two specific use cases. It might be interesting to look at those use cases and ask how close we are to doing those things with the existing technologies. So, that might get a sharper ....

**Tim Elwell – Misys Open Source Solutions – Vice President**

Just to comment on Wes' remarks, I think that's a great idea. My concern here, not knowing specifically what the ONC strategies are is one of scope creep relative to what we're envisioning. So, I would caution provided that we understand what the ONC strategies are that we're specific, for instance, you know the next phases of meaningful use that we don't necessarily get ahead of ourselves.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Tim, that's a great comment. That actually is a big part of my job is to prevent scope creep, but that is something that we really have to watch out for, particularly in this workgroup because we're dealing with

some fascinating topics. There's lots of very, very interesting issues that we have, but we need to keep in mind what our charge is, which is not to judge the report in any way; it's not to even make recommendations. It's simply to provide a list of options or alternatives for ONC in terms of how to implement the report.

In saying that, again, to keep in mind the purpose of the next meeting is really solely so that we understand the report, so that people can have a picture of what it means when the report talks about universal exchange language and the thing that's it going to be somehow extensible, what does all that mean? What does it mean, less constrained or more constrained? That's really what we're simply trying to accomplish on the 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Tim Elwell – Misys Open Source Solutions – Vice President**

Paul, one other question that I had for you relative to, for instance, even the overhead associated with the message types that we're discussing or potentially envisioning. I was curious if there is going to be any discussion on the 20<sup>th</sup> and the 21<sup>st</sup> when we have the computer scientists coming together to discuss this as well as other options. What that might mean from a computing perspective just to, I think, perhaps, give us additional information for consideration when we're talking about bullet point two around the implications.

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Great question, Tim. The meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>, that's not our meeting. That's a meeting that was already planned by ONC, but we will get briefed on that.

**Tim Elwell – Misys Open Source Solutions – Vice President**

I understand that's not our meeting.

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

And we will get feedback from that meeting.

**Tim Elwell – Misys Open Source Solutions – Vice President**

Exactly, okay, great.

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

I'll go through that. So, your question, Tim, is a good segue because what we want to accomplish on the 14<sup>th</sup> is, as I say, try to understand the PCAST Report. The next meeting, which is slightly less than two weeks later we want to try to dig into will be the public comment, so that's what we'll get a presentation on from ONC on what the public comment has been. We'll start reading through, somewhere between those two meetings I'll try to see if we can figure out a way that we can provide information to people that is responsive to Wes' comments. To make sure we also get everybody on the same page on ONC strategies and at least at a high level the programs, not at each individual program. There are a lot of programs.

Then on February 10<sup>th</sup> we will get a briefing on the exact question you just asked, Tim, in terms of what this meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> and the 21<sup>st</sup> came up with and so that will give us the right foundation, I hope, to start working through the charge.

If you look at the meeting dates that was in the e-mail, it says February 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>. We haven't decided yet quite what the days are. It might be perhaps a day and a half, is that we would have an in person meeting of this workgroup in Washington, D.C. and possibly have hearings, possibly bring some people in to give us more information. Then, after that, though, hopefully we've laid the right foundation, we're knowledgeable on the report, we're knowledgeable about the public reaction, we receive some feedback and then we can start to develop a schedule through the rest of February and March to start to lay out our alternatives and options.

Any comments about that, the entire schedule?

**Steven Stack – St. Joseph Hospital East – Chair, ER Dept.**

I am now, after over two years, well accustomed to the tight timelines we work on. Do you have a timeline, you or Judy, when we might know which of those days in February would be the in-person?

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

I'd like to know by next week, so we'll work on that.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Yes, we will all need to work on that as soon as we can. It's certainly a very reasonable request.

**Steven Stack – St. Joseph Hospital East – Chair, ER Dept.**

Thanks.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Any other comments? I also wanted to quickly talk about how we're going to organize these meetings, or do my best to do that because Tim had mentioned the concept of scope creep. I think one of the reasons why ONC asked me to be involved was to help facilitate the meetings. So my job will be to make sure that we stay on target and on the agenda. As some of the people who have been in some of the other meetings I've been involved with know that what that means is that sometimes I will stop people and interrupt them and remind them as to what the agenda topic is.

What I wanted to assure everybody, though, is that we are going to run these meetings in such a way and this process in such a way that everybody's viewpoints will be heard. So if I ever stop you and you feel a little bit frustrated at the end of the meeting and you didn't get a chance to say what you wanted to say—or, alternatively, you've got 17, 18 people on the call and it's sometimes hard to jump in and get your two cents in. Then somehow the topic moves on and you get a little frustrated. You didn't get to say what you wanted to say. So, if any of that ever happens and somehow the meeting ends and you didn't feel like you said what you needed to say. There's a simple thing you need to do, which is send an e-mail to me and to Bill and tell us that you wanted to make a point, tell us a little bit about what the point is and we will figure out a way to make sure you have that opportunity.

Everybody is going to get a chance to say what they want to say and when we get all done, our goal is to produce a document; I don't know what it will look like. It might be a four or five or six page letter that describes the options, but has everybody's name on it. When your name is on it we want to do it in such a way that you feel good that your name is on that document and furthermore you feel 100% comfortable that your thought process was part of what was in that document.

So, that is what our goal is. It also means that we do not have to agree on everything. This is not one of these groups where 17 people have one opinion, but one person has a different opinion and that person with the different opinion feels like they have to go along with everybody else. We can report a minority position on some issues, as long as we sort of report the reason why there is disagreement and sometimes when that occurs it's actually extremely helpful to ONC to understand there are two different viewpoints and why the viewpoints are different. It's always better to have agreement, but we can have disagreement.

I'm sorry, was somebody trying to say something? Okay. So, those are my comments. The other comment I want to give everybody is when you hear all this XML stuff and interoperability, if you're a non-

technical person don't be worried about this. This is not intended to be a discussion that's like deep in the weeds. There will be a few times where we want to show illustrations, but ultimately we are discussing matters at a fairly high policy level.

Having made all those comments, does anybody have anything else they would like to say? Questions? Do you have any comments, Bill?

**William Stead – Vanderbilt – Chief Strategy and Information Officer**

If we have time, the one thing I sort of wanted to clarify was the question around fit with current definition of meaningful use. Because I think the report is proposing a different trajectory and so I think Carl's suggestion that we look at the two use cases in the report—there were some others—but take use cases from the report and say when would that be possible with the current strategy? If we can understand the alternative strategy suggested by the report, how would that maybe change the trajectory? I think that might really help us understand what the report is talking about. I wouldn't think that would be out of scope because I think beyond stage one ONC would love it if somebody was smart enough to know how to increase the trajectory toward value.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Okay, that's very helpful.

**Wes Rishel – Gartner, Inc. – Vice President & Distinguished Analyst**

Yes, the important thing is the scope is defined by the strategy, not by the meaningful use criteria. We haven't necessarily seen that or reviewed that recently, so as long as we understand that, I think we're okay.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

That's a good comment, Wes. One very minor thing I want to remind everybody is to say their name before they start speaking.

**Mark Rothstein – University of Louisville – Chair of Law and Medicine**

I have a question. Chapter five in the report is the privacy chapter and it relies on the ability to adopt these strategies of metadata tagged data elements. My question is to what degree are we going to explore sort of the implications of the recommendations, the technical recommendations in the report because the privacy chapter is key to that and I don't know whether privacy is beyond the definition of what this group is charged with considering.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

My response, I don't know if Farzad is still on the call, but my response is privacy and security is a major strategy of ONC and so we will be addressing it. Is that correct, Farzad?

**Farzad Mostashari – ONC – Deputy National Coordinator for Programs & Policy**

Yes, the implications of the PCAST Report and architecture and metadata tagging and so forth for privacy and security in our privacy and security strategy is absolutely in scope.

**Paul Egerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Absolutely. The PCAST Report, we are not here to make judgments on it, but when you read the blogs and everything, privacy is a major concern, a major issue people have with this report; it's a major issue people have with many things that ONC does and so, of course, we have to address it.

This is a good discussion. I'm looking at the clock and we need to provide some time for public comment also, so, Judy, if you could open the lines to see if there is any public comment.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Sure. Again, we always conclude with public comment. Operator, could you ask if anyone from the public wishes to make a short, no longer than two minute comment to the workgroup?

**Operator**

If anybody from the public would like to make a comment, please press star one at this time to be placed into the comment queue. We have no one in queue.

**Judy Sparrow – Office of the National Coordinator – Executive Director**

Thank you very much, Operator. Thank you, everybody.

**Paul Eggerman – Software Entrepreneur**

Indeed, as Judy Sparrow said, I just want to thank everybody for participating in the introductory call and also, most of all participating in this workgroup. I want to thank Farzad for a great presentation, for participating in our first call; Judy Sparrow and also, Jamie Skipper. I didn't mention Jamie, but she is an ONC person who is going to help us immensely with the whole process, so I want to say thank you to you, Jamie, also.

What I want to encourage everyone to do is have a good weekend. But also, before the next call, if you haven't already done so, please be sure to read the PCAST Report very, very carefully, but this will be an exciting opportunity. So, thank you very much.